



\$~87

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 251/2024 and CM APPL. 1185/2024**

SMT RANJANA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Satish Kumar Tripathi, Advocate.

versus

NEW DELHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL-TVC
& ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr Sriharsha Peechara, Standing
Counsel for NDMC with Mr Akshat
Kulshreshtha, Mr D.S. Bhanu and Mr
Shubham Mishra, Advocates.
Mr Divyam Nandrajog, Panel
Counsel for GNCTD/R-3 with Ms
Surbhi Soni, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

%

04.09.2024

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition seeking several prayers. However, the petitioner has confined the present petition to prayer clause (c), which is set out below:

“c. Appropriate and necessary directions may be issued to the respondents No 1 and or Respondent 2 to the effect that till the time present TVC will be empowered to discharge all its functions as per Act/Rules/ Scheme or new TVC will be constituted they will permit the petitioner to continue her vending in place of her deceased husband late Manohar lal and she may be treated as an existing street vendor in place of her husband for purposes.”

2. Concededly, the issue involved in the present petition is squarely covered by the decision in W.P.(C) 9622/2020 captioned *Kishwari Begam v.*



New Delhi Municipal Council.

3. Mr Peechara, learned counsel appearing for the respondent fairly states that the petitioner would be accorded the same benefits as would have been available to her deceased husband including the benefits of any orders that are passed for a temporary arrangement pending framing of a vending plan and allocation of sites at an appropriate stage.

4. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of by directing that the respondents would be bound down to the aforesaid statement. The pending application is also disposed of.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

SACHIN DATTA, J

SEPTEMBER 04, 2024
RK

Click here to check corrigendum, if any